

**REMARKS**

This application has been amended so as to place it in condition for allowance at the time of the next Office Action.

At the outset, applicants wish to thank Examiners Fontaine and Eashoo for granting and actively participating in the personal interview of January 6, 2004.

As discussed during the personal interview and as explicitly noted on the Interview Summary, agreement between the undersigned and the Examiners was reached insofar as the SCHNEIDER et al. and JENSEN et al. references applied against claims 1-7 are inherently contradictory with one another. As a result, the present obviousness rejection cannot stand. It is the further understanding of applicants that should the next Office Action in the present application include the rejection of one or more claims, such rejection will be non-final.

As also discussed during the personal interview, applicants have added a number of new claims to the present application. New claim 8 depends from independent claim 1 and further recites that the tolerance of an outer diameter of the paper feed roller is suitable for feeding paper. Applicants note that the paragraph spanning pages 5 and 6 of the specification as originally filed identifies a tolerance for the diameter of the cylindrical roller portion typical for paper feed rollers. Furthermore, in the first full paragraph of the specification as

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

originally filed, it is noted that the disclosed method is designed to produce paper feed rollers employed in apparatuses such as printers, facsimile machines, and copying machines. Claims 9-12 recite further limitations of the tolerance of the outer diameter of the paper feed roller and the type of machine for which it is suitable.

New claim 13 depends from claim 1 and recites that the extruding step is performed along a rotational axis of the rotary shaft. This characteristic of the present invention is described throughout the narrative portion of the specification as originally filed, and is further clearly illustrated in each of Figures 2a and 2b. Moreover, such extrusion along the axis of rotation lies in stark contrast to the extrusion taught by the applied SCHNEIDER et al. reference, in which the extruded material is applied in the form of a tape laid down in a helical fashion along the outer surface of the central roller shaft.

For all of these reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejection of claims 1-7 are respectfully requested.

Entry of the above amendments is earnestly solicited. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Application No. 09/807,813  
Amdt. dated January 14, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of September 15, 2003  
Docket No. 8035-1018

Should there be any matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. §1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

By Eric Jensen

Eric Jensen  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 37,855  
745 South 23<sup>rd</sup> Street  
Arlington, VA 22202  
Telephone: 703/521-2297

EJ/mjr

January 14, 2004

BEST AVAILABLE COPY